
ABSTRACTS

Current proposals on alternative defence

The notion of «alternative defence» is subject to different interpretations, as much because different concepts are used, as because the options which follow from these concepts are in themselves diverse. The present article tries to outline the different proposals that the international community is offering, in order to review in depth the current models of defense: minimum deterrence, infranuclear military

defence, non-military defence, and mixed defence. Particular attention is given to those proposals intended to achieve a peripheral defense with high technology, or a territorial defence by means of technocommandos, as well as to the concept of «transarmament», and to the different conceptions of civil defence and non-violent popular defence.

Recession, debt and Counter-Insurgency in Latin America

As of the end of 1984, the future of Latin America is characteristically ambiguous.

After the democratic election in Uruguay, political analysts have been drawing a balance on the progress of democracy in the continent. Using rather a wide conception of democracy, it is possible to arrive at a moderately optimistic conclusion. The military dictatorships of Argentina and Uruguay have given way to civilian governments. The military dictator of Chile has begun to worry his friends and protectors in the U.S. State Department, and he has a serious run-in with the Church. There has been a democra-

tic opening in Brazil with the election of the first civilian president in twenty years. Only the Paraguayan dictatorship continues without substantial challenge.

In Central America the political situation is not so optimistic. Despite the elections which have been held. Various factors taken together make this part of Latin America one of the world's hot spots: the permanent aggression against Nicaragua on political, military, and economic fronts; the «friendly» occupation of Honduras by the U.S. Army; the continuation of insurgent movements in Guatemala and El Salvador. This is no peace, economic mi-

sery continues increasing and therewith the sufferings of a population whose only hope, necessarily partial, is emigration. In Central America there are very few reasons for optimism, and the only one there is, the Nicaraguan revolution, is seriously threatened.

The other countries, traditionally more democratic and politically stable—considered in terms of the always relative stability of Latin America—continue the struggle to neutralize intended coup d'états by professional «Saviours of the Fatherland» on the hand, and the demands of radical groups on the other. Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Panama, and especially Bolivia are the principal trapeze artists on this lightrope of controlled democracy. Peru, disgracefully have been heud, various factors come together to make this regions on of the world's trouble spots, is starting off again on the road which led to its ruin twenty-five years ago. Meanwhile, Mexico and Venezuela are living with the political and economic contradictions of their wealth, hoping desperately that the future will no be as unmanageable as the present.

Haiti, with its anachronistic dictatorship and its long record of degrading poverty, is the shame (of the poor but resplendent) Caribbean, where only Cuba has eliminated poverty and has restored the dignity of

its workers and peasants. Cuba, respected and feared, continues to be the only territory of America free of U.S. imperialism; and because of this it is a constant source of inspiration for the progressive and popular movents of all of Latin America.

Overall in Latin America in the last ten years, there has been progress towards parleamentary democracy of the European and Western kind. There are now fewer dictatorship than there where ten years ago, and while this is very positive, there are stell to many cases of a more democratic appearance which serves to hide the real power of the most reactionary forces of society, such as the landlords, the army, and the U.S. embassy. Such is the case in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, and increasingly, Peru.

Furthermore, while in the political realm there have been some bases for optimism about Latin American, in the economic sphere there are none.

The economies of Latin America, except perhaps those of Brazil and Mexico, continue to deteriorate. The outlook is pessimistic, even disolate. Just to take a look a these countries is to see everywhere the unemployment, misery, popular protests, and economic difficulties which endanger the consolidation of democratic regimes.

The socio-economic situation of Nicaragua in the new model of development.

The triumph of the Sandanista revolution opened up a wide range of social, economic, and political transformations, the goals of which are: firstly, to increase the social welfare of the popular sectors; secondly, to establish a democratic system with active popular participation; and lastly, to overcome in the long term the condition of economic underdevelopment. Agricultural development is the strategy which has been chosen to achieve these goals, through an expansion of the export sector (which is to provide the economic surplus which is necessary for development in the medium and long term) and the simultaneous expansion of the domestic consumption sector (basic grains). A mixed economy, comprising the public sector, the co-operative and small production sector, and the private sector of medium and large producers, is to play a fundamental role in the fulfilment of this strategy.

Political transformations are oriented towards the creation of a type of state and political system which guarantees participation in the elaboration, management, and control of the policies adopted. Last September's election of a President and Vice-president, who now head the Legislative power, added to the earlier creation of participatory bodies at the base and intermediate levels, completes the profile of the new political system.

The purpose of this paper is to define the current socio-economic context of Nicaragua. We therefore first analyse the development strategy followed until 1979 and the reason for its failure; secondly, we define the contents of the new strategy and suggest the difficulties it will encounter; next, we draw a balance of the economic situation of the last 5 years; and, lastly, we present some conclusions.

Tensions in the Magreb

The Magreb currently finds itself in the concrete cultural and historical situation characteristic of those countries which were until recently subjected to colonial dependence or status as a Western protectorate.

These countries are being influenced by a process of self-knowledge through what has been called the «Islamic Renaissance». This phenomenon does not necessarily mean.

That these countries intend to challenge the West; since this process aims above all to be a synthesis between tradition on the one hand, and the technological and political innovation which these countries have experienced through their relations with the European and North American states.

Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, Mauritania, and from a different perspective,

Libya, appear at present to be undergoing this process. Despite this, it does not seem a possible in the short term to make an analysis of regional instability or catastrophe as a consequence. Neither is it possible to speak of imminent or sudden changes in the relations of the Magreb with the Western countries.

Nevertheless, the current confusion in this area has certainly been complicated, from the point of view of the equilibrium of forces that seems to exist between the countries which make up the area, after the recent events originating in the Saharan war. From this arises immediately the image of a bipolar situation in the Magreb with two heads clearly visible, Morocco and Algeria, which frame the other countries of the area in their spheres of influence.

In this way arises, on one side, the conglomeration formed by Morocco and Libya, opposed by the block made up of Algeria, Tunis and Mauritania. However, an analysis of the-

se combinations does not suggest a perspective of permanent stability, as both blocks encompass countries with very distinct ideological, economic and even political interests. There are also systems of alliance and dependence which connect them with the outside world, and in particular, with the superpower from which they receive aid. This is not trivial when, for example, one is speaking of the Libya-Morocco part, given the intense antagonisms which separate the regimes of Gaddafi and Hassan. Tunis and Algeria also have differences which make it impossible to unequivocally categorise them in a permanent form. Similar conclusions result if we form our analysis on the ties established by these countries with third countries or with the superpower. Despite this, and keeping in mind the many existing differences, one can not obviate the reality of a common background of Magreb consciousness, which constitutes the major element of unity between the countries of the area.

Notes on the new cold war: from the "two-track" decision to the "star wars"

Of the different theses concerning the origins of the new cold war (a concept which, although polemical, is useful for evaluating the historical period which was initiated in 1979), the most reasonable is that which considers this origin as, above all, political. Summarising we start from the idea that 1975 was the end of an historical period, which had been based on a series of assumptions which were not to be repeated;

so that an event such as the Helsinki Conference on European Security and Co-operation of 1975 was not the beginning of a new framework of international relations, but rather a project which entered into crisis as soon as it was born (but without knowing it).

If we analyse the events occurring across the world, we see a series of problems whose central effects is a disequilibrium in the traditional

spheres of influence, with conflicts in diverse areas of the periphery which immediately provoked an increase of tension in the central theater of East-West confrontation: Europe. Beginning in 1975 the world has seen, among others, the following crises:

- The U.S. defeat in Southeast Asia, with the withdrawal from Cambodia and Vietnam.
- The fall of the Shah of Iran and the rise of Khomeini's brand of radical Islam.
- The fall of Somoza and the brutal reactivation of the Central American crisis (Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala) a crisis with military aspects, elements of negotiation, and elements of negotiation, and elements external intervention (principally the U.S. intervention in favour of the «contras»).
- The invasion of Afghanistan and the occurrence of «intra-socialist» armed conflicts: Vietnam/Cambodia, Vietnam/China.
- The Middle East conflict, particularly the war of Lebanese intervention of June, 1982.
- The Persian Gulf war, begun at the end of 1980.

Parallel to these events, Europe (with its East-West frontier fixed practically since the end of World War II) continues being the focus of maximum tension between the blocks; although without getting produced an open war, with conventional or nuclear; but with a pro-

liferation of internal crises within each block; and with failed attempts at dialogue —the outstanding examples of which are firstly, the successive sessions of the European Conference on Security and Co-operation in Helsinki, Belgrade, Madrid and Stockholm; and secondly, the arms negotiations, both conventional and nuclear, which were suspended as of December 1983.

The Polish crisis, and the 1980 coup in Turkey, followed by a controlled and *non-viable* return to limited democracy since 1983, can also be mentioned in this context.

What complicates the evolutions of the new cold war is precisely the fact that the superpowers are engaged in a supremely complex re-definition of international relations, in a situation in which tension accumulates in Europe (particularly due to the growth of both conventional and nuclear arsenals); a tension which, more, is activated by local and regional wars and conflicts in the periphery; conflicts which more and more have a greater autonomy and are further from immediate control or manipulation by the superpowers. The Middle East, the Iran-Iraq war, Khomeini's Radical Islam, are all examples of this type of phenomenon. But, in reality, these peripheral conflicts have a «horizontal» extension, which globally affects the new cold war. With the Granada intervention, Reagan provoked by example a hardening of the Soviet posture on the issue of Euromissiles. And so on.

The URSS as seen from "The Islamic Republic of Iran"

Dar al-Islam, that is, the world of Islam and monotheism, and Dar al-Chirk, the world of impurity and polytheism. This is the world divided into two political camps from the point of view of Islamic jurisprudence, as can be read in a very official study, «The Message of Islam».

For Dar al-Islam, the author understands those countries and regions inhabited in the main by Muslims, although in certain cases the regions as such may not have «either a regime or a government legitimately Islamic». Dar al-Islam comprises the following sub-divisions: a legitimate Islamic sovereignty (like the government of the prophet, of Ali C...) and like the Islamic Republic of Iran; a government «apparently just», that is, «those whose leaders lack the necessary condition to guide and direct the community «although they are not» stained by iniquity» (e.g. Libya, Algeria); a regime which «openly flaunts its corruption or its dependence upon ungodly governments» (no contemporary examples are given, though Turkey and Pakistan might be thought of); countries endowed with a mercenary government, and instituted by the powers, as are the majority of the current governments of the Islamic world» (Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Morocco, Afghanistan); and, finally, countries having an ungodly and anti-Islamic government, such as the British government in India, or the Zionist government dominating Palestine and the Lebanon. «The duty of a legitimate Islamic government» concludes A. Chacouri, «consists in behaving according to the norms of peaceful co-existence as regards the govern-

ments of the second order, but in relation to «the governments of the third, fourth, and fifth orders, there is no other path «to follow than to» boycott them politically and fight them militarily(...). It would be necessary to fight them under the banner of the «djiad» or holy war, and liberate the occupied Islamic territories.

On the other hand, Dar al-Chirk, about which the author does not provide the same overall definition as for the first, would also exhibit its own divisions: Dar al-Harb which «does not maintain any economic or political relations (...) (demonstrates its) hostility towards Islam, or also (combats) militarily the Muslims» (e.g. the U.S., South Africa); dar al-'ahd «whose inhabitants are the faithfully of one of the abolished religions (Christianity, Judaism, Zoroastrianism) and which have concluded accords and treaties of friendship and co-operation with the Islamic government»; dar al-ha'ahada (treaty) or dar al-hadna (truce) «comprising those countries which have concluded friendly and peaceful relations with the Islamic countries, on terms of pacts and treaties of non-aggression + interference» (e.g. Korea, India); dar al-hayad (neutrality) which includes «those countries not engaged with either side of the two camps (Islamic and ungodly) and show themselves to be completely neutral». The duty of the Islamic government with respect to a regime of dar al-harb (war) «consists in at least breaking off political relations, and to fight them, if they fight». It should necessarily have a friendly relationship with countries belonging to dar al-'ahd but» in the

current conditions there are no countries which have contracted» accords of «collaboration» and of «friendship». Finally, «it is natural that Islam expects to have «with the countries of dar-al-hayad» relations conforming with the teachings of the Koran, og Figh, in attracting the hearts of the Muslims (...), and in protecting them economically.

A thought certain Muslim countries such as Sadat's Egiypt or Hussein's Jordan as well as non-Muslim countries such as the United States or SOuth Africa find their place in this scheme, the same can not be send of the the USSR. The USSR is nowhereere mentioned by name. Moreover, it is less frequently directly indicated in the speeches and writings of Islamic leaders than are the United States. However, the fact that the Muslims are only a minority in the USSR (but capable of turning the demographic equi-

brium to their advantage around the year 2.000, according to certain estimates), the allusion to a treaty (of «non interference» and «non-aggression» is is true, while the Soviet-Iran treaty of 1921 didn't really show these characteristics) and the placing of Nor Korea (from which Iran buys a good part of its arms) in this category, allow the possibility that the USSR could be classified in this schema among the countries of dor al-ma'âhada, a category which is rather funny. On the other hand fact that the Soviet non finds itself involved in an aggressions againts a Muslimm-inhabited country, moreover, a neighbour of Iran; an dthe implicit and sometimes explicit designation in official Iranian speeches and writing of the Great Northern neeghbour as an enemy to struggle against, makes it difficult and risky to classify the USSR in this category.